



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,329	06/27/2001	Marcus Peinado	MSFT-164268.1	1912
41505	7590	01/18/2006	EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)			SHIFERAW, ELEN I A	
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			PAPER NUMBER	
			2136	

DATE MAILED: 01/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/892,329

Applicant(s)

PEINADO ET AL.

Examiner

Eleni A. Shiferaw

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/31/05.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 16, 20-27, 31, 32 and 36-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 16, 20-27, 31, 32 and 36-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/31/05 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 15-16, 20-27, 31-32, and 36-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vu et al. (Vu, Patent No.: US 6,557,104 B2) in view of Ginter et al. (US 5,892,900).

As per claim 15 and 31, Vu teaches a method/medium for a secure processor to instantiate and authenticate a secure application thereon by way of a security kernel, the method comprising:

entering a preferred mode where a security key of the processor is accessible (Vu col. 5 lines 25-35; *enters a secured mode to access security key/crypto key*);

instantiating and running a security kernel, the security kernel:

accessing the security key (Vu col. 5 lines 35-36);
applying the accessed security key to decrypt at least one encrypted key
for the application (Vu col. 5 lines 35-40);
storing the decrypted key(s) in a location where the application will expect
the key(s) to be found (Vu col. 6 lines 65-col. 7 lines 11); and
authenticating the application on the processor (Vu col. 5 lines 36-40, and
col. 7 lines 7-11); and
entering a normal mode from the preferred mode after the security kernel
authenticates the application (Vu Fig. 2 No. 25 and col. 5 lines 42-47),
where the security key is not accessible; wherein the security kernel allows the
processor to be trusted to keep hidden the key(s) of the application (Vu col. 4 lines 63-col. 5 lines
9); and
wherein the security kernel employs the accessed security key during the preferred mode
to authenticate/verify the application prior to instantiating thereof (Vu col. 5 lines 35-40).
Vu teaches all the subject matter as cited above. Vu fails to explicitly teach:
erasing data in the cache of the processor when entering preferred mode such that any
data previously stored in the cache is not available to interfere with preferred mode operations;
and
erasing data in the cache of the processor when entering normal mode such that any
sensitive data in the cache from preferred mode operations is not available during normal mode
from such cache as argued.

However Ginter et al. discloses the argued subject matter as well-known as follows:

wherein the processor has a cache, the method further comprising:

erasing data in the cache of the processor when entering preferred mode such that any data previously stored in the cache is not available to interfere with preferred mode operations (col. 75 lines 18-29; *at the end of secure processing/when exiting the secure mode/disabling SPU mode, contents of all registers and other temporary storage/cache locations used within secure memory are destroyed*); and

erasing data in the cache of the processor when entering normal mode such that any sensitive data in the cache from preferred mode operations is not available during normal mode from such cache as argued (claim 53; *mode switch circuitry of secure processor that switches normal mode to secure mode and/or secure mode to normal mode, deletes information stored in temporary storage/cache locations that are outside the secure memory upon detection of the secure processing unit is about to transition into secure mode*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ginter et al. with in the system of Vu because they are analogous in secure method of distribution of content/application to end users (col. 315 lines 43-col. 326 lines 48, and col. 73 lines 56-col. 76 lines 36). One would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of erasing the cache data when switching modes within the system of Vu to prevent execution based on “mixed” secure and non-secure instructions and to prevent access carried over from outside mode, cache coherency control access, to insure that the microprocessor is controlled entirely by instructions carried within or derived from the secure memory, and/or to prevent other CPU operations/instructions from exposing the contents of secure memory (col. 74 lines 29-48).

As per claim 25 and 41, Vu teaches a method/medium for a secure processor to instantiate one of a plurality of available secure applications thereon by way of a security kernel, the method comprising:

setting a chooser value to a value corresponding to a chooser application upon power-up (Vu col. 4 lines 12-39, and col. 5 lines 1-4 and 18-20);

entering a preferred mode upon a power-up CPU reset and instantiating the security kernel, the security kernel determining that the chooser value corresponds to the chooser application and therefore authenticating same, the chooser application being instantiated (Vu col. 4 lines 52-col. 5 lines 8, and col. 5 lines 36-40);

entering a normal mode after the chooser application is instantiated and leaving same to run, the chooser application presenting the plurality of available applications for selection by a user (Vu col. 5 lines 40-44 and fig. 2 No. 25);

receiving a selection of one of the presented applications to be instantiated (Vu col. 5 lines 32-40);

setting the chooser value to a value corresponding to the selected application (Vu col. 4 lines 12-39 and page 5 lines 18-20);

entering a preferred mode upon an executed CPU reset and instantiating the security kernel, the security kernel determining that the chooser value corresponds to the selected application and therefore authenticating same, the selected application being instantiated (Vu col. 4 lines 52-col. 5 lines 8 and col. 5 lines 36-40);

entering a normal mode after the selected application is instantiated and leaving same to run (Vu col. 5 lines 40-44 and fig. 2 No. 25);

wherein the security kernel allows the processor to be trusted to keep hidden a secret of the chooser application and a secret of the selected application (Vu col. 4 lines 63-col. 5 lines 29).

wherein the processor has a cache, the method further comprising:

erasing data in the cache of the processor when entering preferred mode such that any data previously stored in the cache is not available to interfere with preferred mode operations (col. 75 lines 18-29; *at the end of secure processing/when exiting the secure mode/disabling SPU mode, contents of all registers and other temporary storage/cache locations used within secure memory are destroyed*);

erasing data in the cache of the processor when entering normal mode such that any sensitive data in the cache from preferred mode operations is not available during normal mode from such cache as argued (claim 53; *mode switch circuitry of secure processor that switches normal mode to secure mode and/or secure mode to normal mode, deletes information stored in temporary storage/cache locations that are outside the secure memory upon detection of the secure processing unit is about to transition into secure mode*); and

Ginter also teaches a chooser value and plurality of chooser applications wherein an end-user selecting a content/application, performing an authentication, analyzing usage and rights and providing a content/application to the user (col. 315 lines 43-col. 317 lines 42).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ginter et al. with in the system of Vu

because they are analogous in secure method of distribution of content/application to end users (col. 315 lines 43-col. 326 lines 48, and col. 73 lines 56-col. 76 lines 36). One would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of erasing the cache data when switching modes within the system of Vu to prevent execution based on “mixed” secure and non-secure instructions and to prevent access carried over from outside mode, cache coherency control access, to insure that the microprocessor is controlled entirely by instructions carried within or derived from the secure memory, and/or to prevent other CPU operations/instructions from exposing the contents of secure memory (col. 74 lines 29-48).

As per claims 16 and 32, Vu teaches the method/medium wherein entering the preferred mode comprises entering the preferred mode upon a CPU reset (Vu col. 4 lines 12-39 and col. 5 lines 18-20).

As per claims 20 and 36, Vu teaches the method/medium wherein the security kernel performs a hash/MAC (message authentication code) over at least a portion of the application and then compares the hash/MAC to a hash/MAC corresponding to the application (Vu col. 7 lines 1-11).

As per claims 21-22, and 37-38, Vu teaches the method/medium wherein the security key of the processor is a symmetric key and the application is instantiated from a code image including a main body and a header including:

KCPU (KMAN)	KMAN encrypted according to KCPU
MAC (main body, KMAN)	message authentication code of the main body

	under KMAN
KMAN (KCODE)	KCODE encrypted according to KMAN

where KCPU is the security key, KMAN is a device key of the portable device independent of the security key, and KCODE is the secret of the application, and

wherein the security kernel applying the accessed security key to decrypt at least one encrypted key for the application comprises:

applying KCPU to KCPU (KMAN) to produce KMAN (Vu col. 6 lines 64-65;
encrypted encryption key);

computing MAC (main body, KMAN) (Vu col. 5 lines 32-40 and col. 7 lines 1-
11);

comparing the computed MAC to MAC (main body, KMAN) from the header to
determine if the code image has been changed (Vu col. 5 lines 32-40 and col. 7 lines 1-
11); and

if the MACs match, applying KMAN to KMAN (KCODE) to produce KCODE
(Vu col. 5 lines 32-40 and col. 7 lines 1-11).

As per claim 23, and 39, Vu teaches the method/medium wherein the security key of the processor is a private key of a public key--private key pair and the application is instantiated from a code image including a main body and a header including:

public key (KCODE)	KCODE encrypted according to the public key
--------------------	---------------------------------------------

where KCODE is the secret of the application, and

wherein the security kernel applying the accessed security key to decrypt at least one encrypted key for the application comprises applying the security key as the private key to public key (KCODE) to produce KCODE (Vu col. 7 lines 31-35).

As per claims 24 and 40, Vu teaches the method/medium wherein the security key of the processor is a private key of a public key-private key pair and the application is instantiated from a code image including a main body and a header including:

public key (HASH (main body), KCODE)	Hash of the main body and KCODE, both encrypted according to the public key
--------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------

where KCODE is the secret of the application, and

wherein the security kernel applying the accessed security key to decrypt at least one encrypted key for the application comprises:

computing HASH (main body) (Vu col. 5 lines 32-40, col. 7 lines 1-11 and lines 31-35);

applying the private key to public key (HASH (main body), KCODE) to produce HASH (main body) and KCODE (Vu col. 5 lines 32-40, col. 7 lines 1-11 and lines 31-35);

comparing the computed HASH to the produced HASH to determine if the code image has been changed (Vu col. 5 lines 32-40, col. 7 lines 1-11 and

lines 31-35); and

if the HASHs match, employing the produced KCODE as appropriate (Vu col. 5 lines 32-40, col. 7 lines 1-11 and lines 31-35).

As per claims 26 and 42, Vu teaches the method/medium further comprising setting the chooser value to the value corresponding to the chooser application upon the selected application being authenticated by the security kernel, wherein upon execution of a CPU reset, the security kernel determines that the chooser value corresponds to the chooser application 72c and therefore authenticates same (Vu col. 4 lines 12-39 and col. 5 lines 18-20).

As per claims 27 and 43, Vu teaches the method/medium further comprising storing the chooser value in a memory location not affected by a CPU reset so that the stored chooser value is available after same (Vu col. 5 lines 11-23).

Conclusion


4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eleni A. Shiferaw whose telephone number is 571-272-3867. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2136

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

E.S.


January 13, 2006



Primary Examiner

AU 2131

1/13/06